

New ideas or questions that probe the behinders of sacred cows whether social, religious, political or scientific are now, and have always been, viewed as heresy by those who are dedicated to maintaining the status quo. This is especially true for organizations of professional wisemen in a field under attack. People in control will not stand for heterodox opinions.

A high IQ has nothing to do with this most human mental disorder. People respond to emotional issues emotionally and any issue which threatens ego, rice bowl or status becomes an emotional issue. Their **EBS** tells them all they need to know about the issue at hand.

There are Mensans who have asked me, “*Rene, you’re not a scientist, why do you care about science?*” I usually evade an answer because I consider that to be a truly dumb question.

I care for two reasons: First, science promised me something that religion could not. It promised an “open minded” approach to life and that it would never resort to authority in a dispute. It failed to deliver on its promise and it has degenerated into another paternalistic religion.

Second, because only “open minded” scientific thinking can defeat the horrendous problems I see directly in front of us as the result of planetary over-population by the masses and the total slavery being imposed by our masters. Most of the world’s problems have always been generated by these same demons. As a result of this, we will be hammered first into the straight jacket of a one world Global Plantation which will then reduce us to the most abject slavery the world has ever seen. It will be a slavery enforced by computers and radio receiver slave collars that will blow off your head for crimes as simple as close tresspass to our masters!

In the past the rebels took to the deserts, the mountains, and the forests and fought there to keep the traditions of freedom alive. There are no hiding places from today’s technology. If we fail to discern the real problem of over-population from the politically correct pseudo problems our politicians and social workers and shrinks babble about, we will become quasi-starving ant creatures, wearing electronic death collars, whose survival is at the complete whim of the new nobility of billionaires who will run that ant hill.

About 20 years ago James Caan starred in a futuristic picture called, “**ROLLER BALL**”. In it he was a super athlete who became the talk of the world because of his ability to survive the deadly game. There were only 10 corporations left in that world and they ruled with iron hands. Everyone should have to see that picture once a year so that they may know our rapidly approaching future.

The proof of this statement can be found in the ratio of CEO salaries compared to the people they employ. In the 1970s that ratio was about 10 to 1; it has climbed to about 30 to 1 and is still climbing. We used to laugh at India because while 99 % of the people were dirt poor they supported their nobility with yearly tithes (gifts?) of precious jewels

Our democratic dream is crumbling even as I write because of the recent onslaught of immigration by English illiterate, ignorant and religiously fanatical immigrants fleeing their own fouled and stripped ant hills, who carry with them the very mind-set that ruined their ant hills in the first place.

Witless fanatics waving banners and praying to God will destroy the type of thinking that might have saved us. Fanaticism is always destructive to someone. Where would be the fun for the priests in running the power trip called organized religion if you couldn't turn your fanatics loose on the non-believers?

Although we generally associate fanaticism with religion, fanatics come in all sizes, shapes, sexes, colors and persuasions. There are patriotic, political and even scientific fanatics, all of whom have surrendered their critical reasoning to their usually shrewd but equally demented leaders. Fanatics are dangerous because they believe that only they and their equally stupid associates possess the truth. Beware their surges of self righteous anger.

- What was once an integral part of the scientific routine, self criticism, no longer works. Today's philosophers break their own arms by patting their own backs congratulating themselves for being able to get so close to the government trough.

They tell us that science is now much too complicated to be understood by anyone but another expert in their field. They contend that progress will only add another decimal place to existing knowledge and that when the decimal is added it will be by one of their own. After years of their lies, half truths, bombast and abuse I am only too ready, willing and able to supply criticism by the truck load.

During the past year I have been receiving reports from people who have the original edition written in 1989, that some professional philosophers are beginning to tout those ideas. You don't think ... Nah!

- As I have shown, our Earth cannot be in perfect balance and this requires either an equatorial bulge or some type of planetary bearings to maintain the stability it exhibits. Without these René Bearings our freely supported Earth would respond by immediately Rolling-Over, bringing the great circle line of heaviest mass to a new equator, thereby changing our existing polar axis. And with each new imbalance it would again slightly re-align the equator.

If this rotation depended solely upon the inertia of the planet, how did the solar flare of 1972 slow the planet down by 10 milliseconds in one day? This was greater than any slowdown ever measured before. How did the earth slowly regain its rotational velocity if it isn't being driven by some solar generated force?

- The meteorologists claim that our weather is driven by wind and barometric pressure. I believe our weather is the result of the movement of our polar air masses and that they are exclusively motorized by the action of the electric forces generated by the solar wind. The polar winds drive our climate, and they in turn are powered and con-

trolled by the solar winds. The solar wind also drives a west to east movement of the air which "scrubs" the oceans, moving them from west to east which, in turn, drags the sea with it, providing the torque to rotate planet.

I believe that the oceanless planets like Mercury, Mars and Venus rotate very slowly compared to Earth being driven primarily by direct electromagnetic effects. On the other hand, the alleged "gas" giants rotate rapidly because of their extensive and thick atmospheres. I also believe that the future will see the densities of the solid planet's decrease and those of the "gas" giants increase drastically. A rock is a rock, is a rock!

- Newton's equatorial bulge, allegedly created by the centrifugal force of rotation, does not stand up to either mathematics, the rigor of a mechanical test or direct observation. How can 3 dynes of force hold up a column of water 13 and a half miles high? Why doesn't the turntable test shoot the water out of the U-tube? Why don't local surveyors see the slope which must result if there is a bulge? Why did a Mensa geodetic surveyor fail to find the error in the test I derived if it is so erroneous?

I have been told that radio telescopes can accurately measure the Earth and detect the slightest shifting of tectonic plates sliding past each other. That's about the same as the joker who said he found another star's planets by computer enhancement of that star's light in October, 1984.

That's in the same league as NASA, who alleges that Houston could discriminate the microscopic Apollo capsule from the Moon's surface when the lunar Lander was descending and was less than 9,000 feet of altitude from the Moon's surface. Not only that, but NASA supposedly had time to check out the orbit, and then decide whether their run for the surface was "Go" or "No-Go". All this at the end of a distance related 2.6 second radio delay in the transmission loop.

- Our experts make miracles for us, the uninitiated, everyday. They make megabuck Gravity Detectors and then gawk in amazement when they detect an exploding giant star or a super nova inverting to a black hole in syncopation with half of Earth's sidereal day.

Neither the gravity wave nor the graviton created by supernovas or giant collapsing exploding stars has ever been detected by the philosophers. Silly theories create stupid results! Why are they trying to prove Relativity by negating the very principle they seek to prove? If mass can move faster than the speed of light, then there is no sense to the Weber gravity detector. If not, then these "giant" stars must be awfully small.

If attractive gravity worked, Rene's Balls would pull each other into contact. As it is now, they will all probably wind up pinned against the eastern rim. I don't know why, but the Lamont-Douherty people, perched on the Palisades in New York, report this type of behavior from objects floated in the caves they have dug under the cliffs.

- The fact that the tides are antipodal precludes attractive gravity despite the mathematical magic that shows anti-gravity. The tidal patterns of diurnal, semi-diurnal

passage? In this case it would be a repulsive tide.

Why are tides in a tropical well at their lowest when the moon is directly overhead? How do the Newtonian apologists explain the fact that during an eclipse the highest tides are always delayed for a few days?

The tidal predictions themselves are not calculated but empirically predicted from past records. Why is the tide for Tahiti and some of the other mid-Pacific islands always high at midnight? What about the zero tides that are found in the Mediterranean Sea? This leads me to think that tides may be more the result of a wobble in the Earth than derived from Sun and Moon. They surely doubled in height during the 70's along the central New Jersey coast.

- The reason why spring scales were shunned for years was because they are sensitive to forces we do not understand. Why did the experts denigrate the scales instead of the theory of gravity?

What causes the anomalous effects that the torsion pendulum scientists are recording during solar eclipses? Why is it that not one of them has the balls either to answer my letters or declare gravity to be a fig-Newton of his imagination?

Why was Dr. Brush so hounded 70 years ago when he reported anomalies in free fall experiments? I proposed to the NSF to hang a really long vacuum drop tube from the side of a building and I was told they already knew everything about gravity. This is "open minded" science at work?

Why was Scripps Institute funded in 1990 to do the experiment I had suggested to the NSF in 1987? Why did the great scientist in charge of that experiment never answer my letter? Did the NSF fund this as I suspect? The Navy was involved and as far as I know only the NSF can call out the Navy for science. Or is it naval intelligence that activates both?

Why do my mine-shaft calculations not agree with attractive gravity? Why should that portion of mass above you not count if gravity is a natural law as we have been told?

- After all the ages the up and down merry-go-round motion of the Moon's Saros cycle should have settled out if only Sun and Earth pull at it.

Why should my "Unproof" still stand after six years of angry and desperate attacks if it is fallacious? A material body should have no choice but to go with the flow and obey the strongest force. Since the solar pull is much stronger, why isn't our Moon lost to us every month? Either the law of gravity is erroneous or the laws of motion are not true. Pick one! But you can't have both.

If the sinousoidal Moon concept is true then the definition of rotation must be changed. And even if true, both Earth and Moon cannot be "always concave to the Sun" as is claimed in the astronomy texts. And if true, why are the rings of Jupiter and Saturn

those same texts written by the "wise men" said that the Earth. Do you believe in an accident free "cross the X race" where each car has no steering wheels or brakes and some of the cars are going in the wrong direction? If not, then you must reject their sinuousoidal moon concept.

- If Newton edited his "Principia", and he had 20 years to do so, why didn't he edit out his erroneous values? Was he a man who would use whatever was handy to prove his point of the moment? Wouldn't that make him the unprincipled liar that I believe him to be? So much of his work has been found in error over the years that all that is left are the equatorial bulge and gravity and I have destroyed them.

The most confusing thing about his work is that he denied that gravity was an innate property of mass. He claimed that thought to be an absurdity. Why did he leave completely unanswered what he thought gravity to be? He also based his gravity on the false assumption that the Moon obeyed Kepler's law in the form it was then.

- I believe gravity to be no more than the attraction and repulsion exhibited by immense magnitudes of electricity. Alternate attraction and repulsion would help to explain the Saros cycle and the dance of the orbiting moonlets and ring particles. Repulsion would better explain the observed tides because it is a known fact that falling water is repelled by a static field.

The Sun generates an incredible charge at a phenomenal voltage. This must affect celestial mechanics to some degree but our philosophers have absolutely proven for 300 years that only gravity counts. Why is it so impossible for them to see that electricity **must** play a part?

An astronomer went looking for a new planet on the basis of barely measurable perturbations in another planet's orbit. Damn, if one wasn't finally found. It was nowhere near where it was supposed to be, nor did the technician who actually found it get the credit, but that's what class war is all about.

Someday, another Newton is going to come along and supply us with calculations that prove that both rotation and revolution, and the planetary and lunar tethers, are electrical. Space is not resistive to electrical currents. Perhaps a pure vacuum is, but not once ions begin to surge. I would not at all be surprised to find a healthy electrical charge on our planet despite the fact that to satisfy the tether force needed there must be a great discrepancy between the Earth's charge and the Sun's. However, I'm sure that the force needed will be found much less than now thought because I believe our Earth's official 'density' to be much too high.

- There is also something very wrong with our basic electric theory! If electrons traveled easier in atoms that are closer together (metals), then why does compression of the air so greatly increase the electrical resistance?

The René Two Leaf Electro-Scope proves that what we think of the attraction and repulsion of static charges is not true. Why have I been totally unsuccessful in getting it

All the Physics books need rewriting and the René Two Leaf Electro-scope proves Coloumb's statement should be revised to read, "Only identical charges, no matter the polarity, repel. All other charges attract." Physicists, rewrite the goddamn books!

- Would a single mylar balloon hooked to a manometer show an increase in internal pressure when strongly charged? Each particle should repel the next and something should happen to the surface of that balloon and be reflected by internal pressure. It's hard to imagine strain without stress. Perhaps it would even decrease the pressure, but a sensitive manometer should show some change.

Would two differently charged balloons, one internal to the other, show a compression of the inner balloon under the strain of a differential charge? If it did, wouldn't this be a demonstration of electric gravity?

- Doesn't my electro-scope show that particle physicists know not whereof they speak? How can you use high intensity electro-static fields to test particles if you are not aware that the electro-static law itself needs modification?

Oh Great Particle-Philosophers, how can you tell us that some basic particles twinkle in and out of existence when you don't even know if they are being attracted or repelled during the nano-pico second of their brief existence?

So much of what we believe true in cosmology is based on Einstein's Relativity. But what truth can there be in Relativity if time after time, astronomers who conduct honest observations, unlike Eddington, cannot find his gravitationally bent light.

- The propeller plane time dilation experiment was ridiculous. Clocks flown zig-zag in different aircraft, at different ground speeds, unsure of their position is not the way to prove anything. Satellite clocks in equatorial and polar orbits would give us the truth. But again, the philosophers don't want to hear any truth different from the truth in their physics Bibles.

Time and time again the astronomical philosophers were forced to revise Hubble's constant to save the "Law" of Relativity. Each time a bigger telescope enabled us see further, we found that Hubble's law was allowing a few more galaxies to exceed the speed of light. Solution, decrease Hubble's constant. Isn't a reduction of 90 percent a bit much?

His constant is based on the assumption that light doesn't tire no matter the distance. Perhaps it does and I reiterate that Michelson and Morley did not test to find if the speed of light was a constant. Our philosophers have read into their results what they wanted to see there.

The René constant of tired light uses the same observable facts and shows that light gets tired and that galactic velocities may not be anywhere in the ranges we think they are. The galaxies themselves are no longer physically being driven apart by the Big Bang. In fact, if they are then we would have to be back at the center of things, as shown by René's exploding balls. An observer in the center of an explosion would see all the balls

moving away and show those the farthest away to have the fastest velocity.

- Because Newton convinced us that our Earth was so massive, those who followed believed our magnetism was integral to a core of magnetic iron. We lost the magnet but kept the iron. Now, of course, our core is thought to be liquid iron surrounded by high density liquid stone. The problem with all this theory is that the only liquid stone we can find is that extruded from volcanoes, and all of that forms relatively light material like pumice. If the Earth is as old as they say, and it was once liquid as they say, then the cooling rate is extremely slow and counter balanced by just the right quantity of radioactive heat. Why is it that we can exactly maintain the 175 mile thick crust? Isn't this a very precarious thermal balance, at best controlled by a gentle, loving, uniformitarian God? A little more heat and the surface melts a little less and the core would freeze into a solid.

- How could our rocks support themselves unless gravity was mostly a surface effect? Rocks that we see at the bases of tall cliffs should explode outward at the tap of a hammer because of the tremendous loads they support. In fact, since rocks are not at all malleable, any brisant explosion such as miners or hard rock tunnel men create should bring down incredible amounts of rock on cliff faces. Why doesn't this happen?

- Our sky is fluorescent, which can be proven by attaching a black paper tube to a light meter. This electrical ionization of our atmosphere also gives the sky its blue temperature color and must drive some of the atoms to tremendous heats for it to show blue. The blue of the sky deepens from horizon to zenith because less atmosphere equals less florescence. This in turn proves that tremendous quantities of electricity must bombard our Earth. In addition, the oceans as they flow through our magnetic lines of force must generate even more electricity and conduct it into the ground.

- I believe that ground electricity, not magma, is the cause of vulcanism. The experts laugh but Pete Ross created an electric volcano. Can they? Can the professors that taught them do it? Our artificial volcano transmuted elements and gave off excess heat. Can any of them do that without the emission of deadly radiation? How unfortunate that no expert ever agreed to come and see it done while Pete was alive.

Most volcanic explosions are so powerful that steam must be ruled out as the prime cause. How do you reintroduce water into the volcanic chamber (boiler) without a high pressure pump? How can steam, with a limit of 3200 psi, blast rocks hundreds of miles without the benefit of a rifled barrel? How are the static electric and magnetic phenomena associated with volcanoes to be explained if volcanoes are not primarily an electric phenomena?

- How can the philosophers explain the maps of Piri Ris and Finneus that show Antarctica's river valleys and mountain ranges which are now buried under a mile or two of ice? They claim the first to be a fraud and the second they ignore. Original copies of the Finneus map have been in libraries for centuries, so any claims of fraud in that direction are ludicrous. The very least that these two maps prove is one of the three following points:

- The human race painfully gains knowledge and then just as painfully loses it. The 1,000 mile long ancient Chinese canal was not done by guess and by God as some Mensans, totally ignorant of construction, have claimed to me. It was executed with malice aforethought using sophisticated leveling devices, at least rudimentary trigonometry and not only knowledge that the world was a sphere, but also a knowledge of the approximate diameter.

In Sacsayhuaman, Peru a carved monolithic stone pyramid is buried up-side-down. It weighs over 40 million pounds and was quarried over 200 miles away. There it sits and our philosophers ignore it. Hell, they don't even want to tell you about few stones of red granite in the great Pyramid that weigh over 100 tons apiece. Do you still believe that a stone this size was hauled up a ramp?

Cyclopean ruins are found on every continent and are called antei-deluvian structures, meaning that they were built before the "mythical" flood. Immense stone structures are even found on certain Pacific islands. Some sit on basalt arranged as a crib, and then there are basaltic roads that lead into the ocean.

Our experts fail to explain Tiahuanaco sitting there two miles above sea level. Do they actually think it was built there? And if so, how did the sharks and sea horses get into Lake Titicaca? Or do they think that the pre-Incans were so enthralled at the idea of swimming in ice cold water with sharks that bite that they built the city as a spa?

They can't even explain how we lost the knowledge of electricity over the past two millennia. The Near East had batteries and the Far East made aluminum. In both west and east platinum jewelry has been found, and very high heats are required to work this element into jewelry.

- Our geo-philosophers tell us that the magnetic poles reverse their polarity from time to time. The Earth has only one shorted turn in its coil, and to toggle the magnetic poles it would need the kind of ground current that boggles the mind. Where would they get it from in a uniformitarian universe? Once again they believe in magic while preaching against it.

I would bet that if paleo-magnetic core samples were oriented prior to their removal, they would show that the old poles had a random orientation. Wouldn't this prove that our planet does "Roll-Over" rather than that the poles magnetic fields reversed?

- This leads us to so-called Ice Ages. Our experts believe in periods of world wide glaciation that at times grows ice clear down to the equator. They must believe because the same evidence that they find in temperate zones exists in equatorial regions. I too, believe in Ice Ages. The Antarctic ice age is on right now. There is always an Ice Age occurring where ever the poles happen to be.

Then they would have us believe in anti ice ages ("interglacial peroids") so warm, that elephant type creatures could be fed during a 6 month night by the profusion of grasses, bushes and trees grown in the now tropical climate of the polar regions. On again, off

again, Ice Ages would have to occur with their melting formerly torrid tropics and the formerly frozen poles.

What they have never provided was a believable mechanism for this process, but they all wind up with a drop in the planetary temperature. They all fail to take into account that glaciers require a heat pump. The more widespread the ice, the larger the heat pump that is needed to evaporate and transport the prodigious amounts of water that will form the ice.

In their zeal to be politically correct, "open-minded" scientists, they fail even to acknowledge that only growing ice caps can calve ice bergs. Yet they tell us that we are now in the beginning stages of a hot house effect.

The popular philosophical opinion about the rising oceans is to blame it on melting polar caps. If this were true then the Antarctic beaches the Russians mapped in the early 1800s would be again exposed. The most probable cause is that the oceans have expanded due to less than a degree temperature change. A more logical cause would be the great number of active volcanoes that lie under the Pacific. Unfortunately this heat will prime the polar heat pump and pile up even more ice.

- If we re-examine what are considered absolute proofs of ice ages, we see that moving water also produces similar, if not exactly the same results. Erratic boulders were more likely carried by tidal waves that reached to the sky. Waves like these would carry more boulders, bigger boulders, faster and further than any sheet of ice. The only proof of ice ages are the depressed basins that dot the globe. The newest one to be formed lies under the Antarctica ice sheet.

Until a few short years ago the expert water-philosophers denied both the existence of giant storm waves and giant tidal waves. Then the Lituyo Bay glacier dropped a berg into its sound which drove a giant wave, a third of a mile high, (1720 feet) onto the far shore, sweeping away a forest. And it did it in front of witnesses. Can you imagine the size of the wave it would take to over run an entire continent? A wave so tall and broad that when it finally collapses it is in the middle of a continent, it begins to selectively drop the sweepings of its travels. First it lets go of the giant boulders, then the smaller rocks, then the carcasses it has created in its journey and last of all, the plant life.

Coal, anyone? Pile up a forest and cover it with dirt. Oil? Dump all the fish from a sea into a basin and cover with sand. Bone caves? Let the shattered carcasses swirl into a cave. Anything is possible when the Earth twists under its oceans at the equatorial rotational speed of 1000 mph.

- We have been told by some anonymous genius that a temperature drop of only two degrees would start the next Ice Age. We would lose more of our already precarious food supply, but even were it to get cold enough for the oceans to freeze, there would be no world wide glaciation. No heat pump, no ice sheets. Have you ever heard of a Siberian Glacier?

Despite Carl Sagan's pessimistic pronouncements about the hot house effect, it has been

Nor did the people in Pensacola's Historical society who failed to provide me with the requested information on the presence of manatees before the turn of the century. Or maybe you think you will see a gator in the "old muddy" near St. Louis next summer?

I'll bet you that Carl Sagan wouldn't put a dime on the chances of the survival of young gators if a breeding pair were put back into the Dismal Swamp in Virginia! How about it Carl, want to go down to the Florida Panhandle coast and count manatees next summer? Should we wait a few years for your global warming effect to melt the Greenland ice cap enough to free the buried airplanes without digging and blasting for them?

- Before you laugh at HAB's theory as I once did, turn a world globe upside-down and take a long look at Antarctica. You will see that the center of the ice mass is greatly eccentric to the center of rotation; 5,000,000 square miles of ice up to two miles deep is a tremendous unbalancing force on a spinning planet. Without an equatorial bulge the only question left to ponder is, how strong are the Rene' Bearings?

HAB believed that we were in the closing moments of this epoch. He believed this because each epoch is only about 3500 years long, and this one has lasted over 7,000 years so far. I don't know what to believe about that, but I do believe that the Earth does "Roll-Over", at fairly frequent intervals, producing the catastrophe that suspends the normal processes of erosion and decay, and leaving behind fossils in the rocks plus even impressions of rain drops, small animal tracks and jelly fish. And when it happens the magnetosphere collapses and lets the deadly radiation of space pour onto whatever sections of the Earth are in daylight.

Few people live through this catastrophe, and those that do revert to tiny tribes of uneducated and uncivilized nomads trying desperately to eke out survival in caves. They will stay in them only until conditions improve. Go ask a spelunker what it's like to make a camp in a cold, damp cave.

Because our Earth periodically "Rolls-Over", this does not mean that an additional astronomical catastrophe is impossible. To this day no one really knows what hit Siberia in 1908. These are natural disasters over which we have absolutely no control. However, there are three more world wide disasters that will try to overwhelm us in the next decade. We already discussed the population problem which AIDS may well ameliorate to some degree. Ameliorate hell! It may do the whole job and wipe out humanity first and human beings second. I have heard that it genetically alters the make-up of the cells, and if that's true there can be no cure. If pushed hard enough we lose our humanity so that human beings may survive.

- The next disaster is called atomic energy, and we were lied to right from the very beginning of the atomic age. Where are the cadmium control rods we were promised? What happened to the cadmium spears to disembowel the atomic beastie when it got fractious? Not if, when? And why did we create death pits from hell that hold a hundred tons of fuel when we were led to believe the reactors would be much smaller? Where is the scientific solution to the problem of the atomic beastie's deadly crap that we were promised fifty years ago? A half century of empty promises from death wishing control

I truly believe that the regular uranium fuel rods are just batteries that have been created and charged with their deadly energy by the use of coal, water power and oil. If this process were so economically feasible, why does the TVA still use most of the coal mined in the world after almost 50 years of production? If the fuel rods weren't so heavily subsidized we wouldn't have an atomic industry would we, Slick? But because everything is so secret we will never find out, will we Slick?

Why is it, Slick, that everything is still locked up behind the secrecy act of World War II? With every country bigger than my home town of Paterson, NJ operating an experimental reactor, is it any wonder why I say that the only secret left is to keep us bumpkins uninformed.

Accident after accident has racked the industry on a world wide basis. Some of them have resulted in disasters and most were swept under the rug. I also wonder if the big power companies don't have small secret reactors hidden in big buildings on their grounds and maybe even a few big reactors that we haven't been told about yet.

- I have been told that all the power generating reactors in this country are "Boiling Water" types. They are constructed of reinforced concrete built into the shape of a right cylinder with a diameter of about 40 feet and a height of at least 30 feet. Separating the "boiling water" from the concrete is a stainless steel liner that is at least 2 inches thick. They are supposed to have an operating pressure of 560 psi which would load the walls and flat end caps with 80,640 pounds per square foot.

The total pressure trying to separate walls and end caps is over 100 million pounds. Unfortunately, the reactor's stainless steel liner carries little or none of these loads because it is on the inside of the pit leaving only the ferro-concrete to resist these tremendous tensile forces. All tensile loads in this composite material are carried by the steel construction re-bars whose design loads are limited to 20,000 pounds per square inch.

The end caps must resist these loads while acting as a flat plate. The ends cannot be dome shaped because the control rods must be continually moved in and out of the pile. If two intersecting steel beams were used to restrain this load, each would have a bending moment of 3 trillion inch pounds, which would require a section modulus of 150,000 to restrain. No such beam is made.

If we use 4 intersecting beams, the load on each beam is only 25 million pounds, which gives a bending moment of 1.5 trillion, requiring a section modulus of only 75,000. Again there is no such beam. In fact the largest stock beam made is 48 inches, deep 22 inches wide, and weighs 1000 pounds per foot, and this beam's section modulus is only 20,000.

All of this leads me to believe that the true operating pressure of the reactor pit is less than 10 psi. This pressure would be more in line with the name, "Boiling Water". Since the steam turbines which actually turn the generators would be incredibly inefficient at this pressure, the low pressure steam must enter a very large heat converter and heat the water that is returning from the turbines. However, since you can't get either more heat

steam at 560 psi is 479° F. Add the normal atmospheric pressure of 14.7 psi and we get a water temperature of 482° F. Water at 10 psi has a temperature of 240° F and holds only about a third of the energy that it does at 482° F. This means that the conventional fuel provides the other two thirds of the BTU of these power plants. This is an incredible price to pay for poisoning the planet with radioactive wastes for which no one has yet solved the waste disposal problem.

- I also wonder, Slick, if you have secret reactors hidden near major population centers. I can't help but question where the Linden, NJ, power pipe got the 946 megawatts that was being sucked into New York City just before the famous blackout of 1976. Is there a reactor hidden near there? A small reactor? Perhaps near Keasbey?

The Martin's Creek power plant is located just across the Delaware River from Belvidere, NJ. The sign at their entrance proclaims them to be a conventional fuel plant. However, for some obscure reason they built two humongous cooling towers of the type that symbolizes atomic power plants.

The reason that these towers are needed in atomic plants is to allow the reactors a place to spill an amazing amount of heat in a very short time. If a conventional plant gets a little too hot, the safety valves lift, venting the steam to the air and the fuel is instantly shut down. The very nature of the atomic beast called a reactor is that it is always precariously perched on the edge of disaster.

Why would any company put up expensive atomic style cooling tower unless they were running a reactor or planning to run one very soon? Are they fooling you, Slick? Or are you fooling us again?

When you ship the "used" fuel rods, don't the trucks carry little radiation cards and sneak down the highways in the middle of the night? My guess is they carry three drivers and extra fuel tanks and never stop rolling until they reach their destination. Why is that, if everything is so safe? I have been told by a very bitter atomic engineer dying of cancer in New York City that each rod must be entombed in a thick lead coffin and that despite that protection, a motorcyclist tooling by in the opposite direction at 60 miles an hour sustains a small dose. What are the truck drivers getting? How about the civilian cars that drive behind that truck for an hour or so?

If this industry is so safe, why hasn't the Price-Anderson act been revoked? Is it because you know that there is not enough money left in this bleeding, gut-wounded country to pay for a Chernobyl-type accident? And why does the insurance industry absolutely refuse to insure against any damage from any sort of nuclear accident? Price-Anderson's limit of 560 million is peanuts should a Chernobyl-type accident happen up-wind from a major population center. The people who lived would probably wind up with pennies on the dollar, and that's before they paid their attorney.

- Each time you insert a new fuel rod you create a thousand pounds of long lived radioactive materials that simply did not exist before. Each time a little accident forces a plant to vent to air or ground, a little more long lived radiation is added to the environment.

immense amounts of radioactive materials that were not originally stored in mother Earth.

Each time a TMI, Chernobyl, Windscale, Kasli or Chelyabinsk blows up more land and sea is contaminated. That contamination enters more deeply into the food chain, further increasing each of our personal intakes of radio-nuclides. The charts of permissible radiation are all based on external exposure and allow at least a hundred times the true permissible exposure. But when a particle is ingested or inhaled there is no permissible limit.

Right then and there you are 100 % guaranteed a cancerous future. That particle doesn't even have to originate on your continent. A piece of plutonium ash falls on your face during a rain storm and you lick your lips.

The real leaders of this and every country are the heads of old line of super-rich families of international, non-Christian bankers who have no allegiance to any country. They are not the political figureheads we love to hate. What really scares the hell out of me is that these people, our moneyed nobility, are so stupid that they are believing their own atomic propaganda.

Hey guys, listen up, no matter how many billions you have scattered out all over the world, no matter how much food and water you have squirreled away for you, your family and your descendants, you have to be told:

“THERE AIN'T NO PLACE TO HIDE!”

And that also goes for their paid flunkys, the academics and professional scientists who suck up to them. You created this mess and you must finally accept responsibility for it and help straighten it out.

And always remember that ... **you are entitled to believe anything that you want. However, remember that when observational data or experiment conflicts with a theory, no matter how beautiful the theory or how impressive the credentials of its author, a rational person pitches out the theory.**